

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-38 were pending in this application. In this Amendment, claims 1, 13, 15, 18, 20-22, and 28 have been amended. Claims 39 and 40 have been added. Accordingly, upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-40 will be pending.

In the Office Action mailed March 6, 2007:

- Claims 1-33 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. 2004/0072544 to Alexis ("Alexis") in view of UK Patent Application No. GB 2 366 131 to Gareth Anthony Edwards et al. ("Gareth"); and
- Claims 34-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexis in view of Gareth and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0136839 to Seshadri et al. ("Seshadri").

To the extent that these rejections might still be applied to the presently pending claims, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. The following remarks are organized under subheadings corresponding to the rejections.

Rejection of Claims 1-33 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The combination of Alexis and Gareth (last name: Edwards) fails to render any of claims 1-33 and 38 obvious, because each of the claims recites or includes by its dependence from a base claim, at least one feature that is not disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

Each of independent claims 1, 13, 22 and 28 has been amended to recite a similar additional feature distinguishable over the prior art of record. Claim 1, for example recites a

system that includes, among other things, a telephone base station that facilitates communication between a first and second electronic device that are each linked to the base station through use of a short range radio transceiver, wherein the first device is configured to communicate with an external network using a separate communications link while the first device is in communication with the telephone base station. To further emphasize the invention in this regard, claims 39 and 40 have been added to recite that the first device is alternatively a cell phone or a computer linked to a data network. New claims 39 and 40 do not add new matter. Support for the amendments and new claims can be found, for example, in paragraphs [0020], [0025] and [0032] of the present application. Paragraphs [0020] and [0025], for example, describe a base station establishing simultaneous wireless communication with a cellular telephone and cordless handset. This feature facilitates use of the cordless handset to make and receive calls directed to the cell phone from an external wireless network. The cellular phone (first electronic device) and cordless phone (second electronic device) are in communication with each other through the base station, while the cellular telephone (first electronic device) is in communication with the wireless network (external network) to complete the call.

In rejecting claims 1-33 and 38, the Examiner relied on Gareth as teaching the use of first and second RF short range transceivers to facilitate exchange of information from a first and second electronic device through a base station. However, these grounds of rejection are now moot, because, as discussed below, Gareth fails to teach or suggest the feature recited in amended claim 1, wherein a first of at least two electronic devices is configured to communicate with an *external network* using a separate communications link *while* the first of the at least two

electronic devices is in communication with the telephone base station using the second short range RF communications radio transceiver.

Gareth specifically teaches use of a network having a plurality of RF base stations. (Abstract.) While Gareth teaches that devices such as PCs (element 15, Figure 2) and cell phones (element 22, Figure 2) can each communicate with a base station of the network over a Bluetooth link, Gareth fails to disclose the feature recited in claim 1, wherein the device is configured to simultaneously communicate with an external network. On the contrary, the portions of Gareth relied upon by the Examiner teach that all communications with the device are through the base stations: "The incoming calls, either internal or external, arrive to the user cellular phone 22 via the base stations 20, such as gateway 20-4 in Figure 2. In the same way the cellular phone 22 is programmed to direct outgoing calls via the short range link . . ." (Gareth, page 11, lines 20-24.) Thus, in operation, the network of Gareth restricts communications among RF linked devices to the link between the device and the base stations. At least for this reason, Gareth, as well as Alexis for that matter, fails to teach or suggest at least one feature recited in amended claim 1. Thus, the teachings of Alexis and Gareth, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to render obvious claim 1, as currently amended. The same applies to independent claims 13, 22, and 28, which each recite a feature similar to that added to amended claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 13, 22, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-12, 14-21, 23-27, 29-33, and 38-40 each depend from one of base claims 1, 13, 22, and 28 and thereby include by reference all of the limitations of their respective base claims. At least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, Applicant

respectfully submits that all of dependent claims 2-12, 14-21, 23-27, 29-33, and 38-40 are also patentable over the combination of Alexis and Gareth.

Rejection of Claims 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The rejection of claims 34-37 was predicated upon the rejection of claim 28 as being unpatentable over Alexis in view of Gareth. Inasmuch as amended claim 28 patentably distinguishes over Alexis in view of Gareth, claims 34-37 must likewise do so. Nor does the use of AT commands purportedly taught by Seshadri cure this deficiency. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.


In view of the foregoing, all of pending claims 1-40 in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

PAUL HASTINGS JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP
875 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-551-1700

Respectfully submitted,

S. HUNDAL

By:


Steven P. Arnheim
Registration No. 43,475

Date: June 6, 2007

SPA/RAR/aer
Customer No. 36183